

DRAFT - IMAC QA Subcommittee Meeting Minutes April 26, 2004

Members Present: Bernadette Connolly, Lisa Hanson, Pam Lohaus, Marcia Williamson, Vicki Jessup, Mary Moyer, Rick Zynda, DHFS; Kathy Judd, Chris Elms, Dane County; Jackie Bennett, Racine County

Via Conference Call: Joanne Ator, Door County

Members Absent: John Haine, Marilyn Rudd, DHFS; Lorie Mueller, La Crosse County; Jacaie Coutant, Milwaukee County

1. March 22, 2004 Minutes

The March minutes were reviewed. No changes or corrections - minutes approved as written.

2. Continue APE Discussion:

The group was not sure exactly why this is on the agenda, because the final conclusion of this group at the last meeting was to **uphold the previous recommendations** that were made to IMAC in June 2003. John had provided a link to the document and the assumption is that we should review the document for any changes before it goes back to IMAC.

The following changes were identified and should be made to the July 24, 2003 document:

- Under Charge 2004 IM Contract should be changed to 2005 Contract;
- Also under Charge the 5th dot point should be deleted as this issue belongs to another Subgroup;
- 2003 error information is available. The data in the document should be updated to the most recent available (to avoid being sent back by the IMAC Committee), including the charts;
- The new APE multiplier should be close to the beginning of the document;
- In #5, recalculate the APE pass through using the new data;
- Although bonus money is available for several different categories not directly attached to the error rate, clarification should be added that no bonus money is available if the state exceeds the federal tolerance level.
 - There was some concern that the bonus money would be received after the year's budget is over and county boards would find a way to move that money to affect other programs. Perhaps if we allowed the bonus to offset the penalty, it would resolve some of the problem. The clarification that there would be no bonus money if the state was in penalty status was confirmed by Allen Shannon who happened to call during the meeting. We must make this clear to IMAC and the counties.

John should request time in the 5/20 IMAC Committee Meeting agenda to present our proposal.

We discussed the current error rate and were informed that the reduced asset verification may have contributed to a recent jump in the error rate. A case with excess assets results in ineligibility rather than a change in benefits. Generally that's a higher \$ error. This brought a question about the verification request process and the pending status of a case. Marcia and Lisa

will check to see how this is supposed to work. There was some confusion about what the “?” does and the what “Q?” does.

3. Continued Discussion of MA review process for QAP and FS 2nd party process for 2004 QAPs:

MA QAP – Mary Moyer is coordinating the MA 2nd party review process.

A Draft memo is currently being reviewed. The instructions and an EXCEL review tool will be attached.

- The three-month sample will be issued in quarterly intervals, and each quarter may have a different focus, i.e. Family MA, EBD MA, etc.
- A lag time is built into the sample selection to allow for availability of resources. October, November and December '03 are the first sample's months with a Family MA focus.
- Agencies will have 3 months to complete the sample, but they can submit the cases as they are completed.
- The completed reviews will be e-mailed to a designated person.
- Errors should be corrected as they are identified.
- The goal is to begin June 1. The memo is under review, but the tool and instructions are not yet complete.

Several questions arose from this overview. How will counties with more than 1 review per month in their plan obtain a sample? The sample can accommodate this difference.

Will there be a way to merge review data for counties who have already done reviews into the data collection? Yes, this information will be collected and maintained separately.

For the next contract, what should be included? More cases for a more statistically representative sample? One case per county, particularly Milwaukee, will not provide a representative analysis for a county. This issue brought much discussion:

- An estimate of time per case is 30 minutes; however, some depending on the need for additional verification could be 1-1 1/2 hours.
- Will IMAC accept an increase?
- We don't know the impact of the workload yet.

The decision was to allow time for this to get started and revisit the question in 6 months.

FS QAP – Lisa Hanson provided an update on a report for agencies to pull their 2nd Party Review sample. This has been identified as a special need for supervisors in obtaining new applications and newly reviewed cases to review. Kevin is working on this report but it's unknown if it is from the Data Warehouse or ACD.

Lisa shared the two tools that were developed for the Milwaukee Find & Fix. One is 11 pages and results in a comprehensive review of a case. The tool actually being used is the 2-page form that targets high error potential elements. DXRC, which checks data exchange for a case, should be added to the form. We may recommend that agencies incorporate this form into their 2nd Party Reviews to target those elements with the highest QA error ratio. They can expand their review if they choose or use the longer tool. Our goal should be no more than 1 page back to back. Chris Elms provided the Dane Co 2nd Party Review Form for our review which is 1 page complete.

MEQC - Vicki Jessup provided an update on the MEQC process. There are two full time FS QA reviewers assigned to perform the MEQC reviews. They are Pat Quasaire from Milwaukee and Sharon Woelfel-Nett from Green Bay. The target is EBD & LT MA and 600 cases will be sampled. The memo left it open whether the cases will be reviewed on site or mailed in. The reviewers will make that decision based on their needs. A Dunham Express account has been set up. The files will be picked up at the agency and should be returned within 3 days in most cases. Third party resources are contacted if necessary or as a last resort the recipient is contacted. They began pulling October '03 cases in April.

A survey to the recipient is being planned which includes asking how they applied, i.e. mail-in, face to face. A survey is also being designed for the EBD workers.

The Training and IT Subcommittee is discussing the benefits to adding the capacity for individual workers to enter their caseload type in Pathlore. This could be used to determine who should attend training designed specifically for certain programs.

4. : Child Support Alerts Issue

Jackie Bennett brought to our attention a concern about alerts from CARES/KIDS. These alerts are considered a 3rd party source and must be acted on. Not all of the alerts related to a change in income, however, they must be investigated and determine whether or not a new amount should be budgeted. Copies of one worker's multiple alerts were included to show how frequent they can be. Another question is, how would QA look at a case with these multiple changes if the worker did not recalculate the CS income each time an alert resulted in a minor change? It's felt that the notice of AP Court Order doesn't relay any information of value to a worker.

There is also a great deal of inconsistency between counties regarding Child Support noncooperation of a noncustodial parent.

At a recent JAD session, a Child support Summary screen for CARES is being discussed. It would provide workers with the last 3 complete months of support paid to a FS customer, separate current support from arrears, and calculate an average. Any payment made to date would also be shown. A comment screen would also be available for worker comments.

5. Next Meeting: Monday, May 24th

6. Notetaker: Lisa Hanson